DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 222 929 CS 503 972

AUTHOR Hunsinger, Paul
TITLE Methodologies of Teaching Communication Ethics.
PUB DATE Nov 82
NOTE 35p.; Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the Speech Communication Association (68th, Louisville, KY, November 4-7, 1982).
PUB TYPE Guides - Classroom Use - Guides (For Teachers) (052) -- Speeches/Conference Papers (150)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS *Class Activities; *Communication Skills; Course Descriptions; *Drama; Dramatic Play; *Ethics; Higher Education; *Role Playing; *Teaching Methods

ABSTRACT

Often the way one communicates ethical choices is conditioned by the dynamics of the communication process more than by a well-developed "ethical system." Sociodrama is an excellent method of teaching both ethics and communication skills. The technique can be used for playing out any real-life situation, but unlike much actual life experience, it allows one to learn from mistakes and eliminates the anxiety that often causes repeated mistakes in real life. Students can develop case studies of scenarios and then turn them into scripted sociodramas to be performed in class. A sociodrama script should have background and context, narrative and plot, a point of entry where the free action begins, and a situation that forces an ethical decision. The scenarios should not include speculations about motives or any suggestions that might explain the behavior of the people in terms of choices that were predetermined. The student/director of a scenario provides (1) initiative, (2) encouragement, (3) guidance, (4) instructions for role reversal, (5) time intervention, (6) instructions for use of alter-egos or consciences for characters, (7) addition or removal of characters, (8) termination, and (9) follow-up discussion. An unstructured or impromptu scenario may require a more structured script as a warm-up exercise. (Various scenario scripts are included.) (HTH)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED222929

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

X This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official NIE position or policy.

METHODOLOGIES OF TEACHING COMMUNICATION ETHICS

Paul Hunsinger

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

Paul Hunsinger

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

CS503972

Paul Hunsinger
CBN University
School of Communication
Virginia Beach, VA 23463

METHODOLOGIES OF TEACHING COMMUNICATION ETHICS

One of the most common concepts found in the various definitions of ethics is that ethics includes choice and decision making. The choice is usually between the better and the best rather than between good and bad and usually the methodology of choosing is a part of the ethical matrix. When a person makes an ethical decision or choice it must be communicated. Prior to the choice the thinking and feeling is internal but at the point of choice it becomes a communication problem.

Ethics and Communication

At the very outset it must be stated that communications and ethical decision making are so intertwined that one can not be thought of without the other. Ethics, as a systematic, moral, philosophical, and religious set of principles, is established by a dynamic process of communication. The formulation of an ethical code is both an intra and interpersonal process and the expression of ethical decisions is dependent upon communicative abilities.

Ethics is more than thinking and talk. Our attitudes and actions are the means of communicating our ethical positions. However, when we enter into ethical decision making exercises, we often find that the way we communicate our ethical choices are conditioned by the dynamics of the communication process more than by our well developed "ethical systems". If we are responsive to feedback from others in our communication we can almost feel the pressures being exerted when we make ethical decisions involving other people.

For example, it is rather easy to sit back and think of our ethical stances regarding honesty. We believe we are honest and want people

to be honest with us. We want to always speak the truth. But, put us in a situation where we are with a person we love, and we have to make a choice between being honest and possibly hurting their feelings or being a "little dishonest" and not hurting them, most likely we will choose to keep truth from hurting them.

On the one hand, we want our ethical beliefs to be strong and consistent, but on the other hand we want to be loving and kind. We don't want to really hurt another person but truth is often painful and we adjust our ethics accordingly. So, as we examine the dilemma we find that it may be the way we communicate our decisions that causes hurt to others rather than what was our ethical decision. Good communication enables us to be ethically consistent and honest and loving and kind.

In Communication Ethics one of the best methods of teaching the subject is by using sociodrama. The sociodrama is an excellent method of handling both the learning of ethics and the development of communication skills.

The Concept of Sociodrama

Every individual lives in a world in which he partakes in a number of roles. These roles may look private and personal and quite specific to him but private worlds overlap. The larger overlapping portions are collective with only the minor portions being private and personal.

Every role is a fusion of the private and collective elements. Every role has two sides - a private and collective side. In other words, the private roles appear like a veneer which gives the core of collective roles an individual coloring. It is the father, the mother the lover, the soldier versus a father, a mother, a lover, a soldier. In the first case the father, the mother, etc. are portrayed as they are found to operate in a specific culture; while in the other a specific

lover, a particular individual is represented. In the second case these forms of role-playing are lived and experience in collective ways and must be portrayed in a collective way. These roles which represent collective ideas and experiences are called sociodramatic roles.

The concept of sociodrama recognizes that man is a role-player that every individual is characterized by a certain range of roles which dominate his behavior, and that every culture is characterized by a certain set of roles which it imposes with varying degrees of success upon its members.

The true subject of sociodrama is the group. It is not limited by a set number of individuals, it can consist of as many persons as are necessary and people can be taken out of and put into groups, thus changing the nature of the group and the nature of the individual. In sociodrama, the basic group is the audience. The group formed by the audience is already organized by the social and cultural roles which, in some degree, all of the audience group shares. It is, therefore, incidental who the individuals are, or by whom the group is composed, or how large their number may be. It is the group as a whole which has to be put upon the stage to work out its problem since the "audience" is the group. The actual content of the group are the interrelated persons composing it, not as private individuals but as representatives of the interwoven cultures.

Since the subject in sociodramatic procedure is not a person, but a group, it is not an individual Black who is considered, but all Blacks. There are inter-cultural conflicts in which an individual is persecuted, not because of himself, but because he is a member of a group. It is not, for example, a Jew but all Jews, and in reverse the persecutor is in the mind of the persecuted not an individual Nazi,

but all Nazis. It is not of primary concern, who portrays the role of a Jew or a Nazi as long as he is a member of the group's "gestaldt".

The protagonists and antagonists in sociodrama may be emotional extensions of many egos. In relation to the audience, it is not identification of the spectator with the person on stage, presuming some difference between him and the character whom the actor portrays. it is rather collective identity. In the primary phase of collective idntity, there is no need for identification because there is no difference between spectators and actors: all are protagonists. (Moreno 1968, p. 44)

Sociodrama not only deals with the large categories of groups, such as the minorities, but focuses on the problems in relationships which people have as classes and other categories. The emphasis is on a particular role, the role of a woman, mother, son, foreigner, lawyer, teacher, etc. It is a group method and generally deals with roles and relationships common to most members of whatever group it might be. Sociodrama, in order to become effective, must develop deep-action methods. The sociodramatic approach deals with social problems and aims at social catharsis-healing.

Just as characters in a sociodrama may be representing various cultural groups, they may also be the centering or focal point for others when they are in a situation where ethical choices must be made and communicated. Communication ethics, when taught using the techniques of sociodrama, becomes far more life-like since the methodology not only forces the persons involved to make choices, but to show how those choices were communicated.

Sociodrama As A Method of Teaching Communication Ethics

The sociodramatic procedure is ideally suited to the study of communication ethics, especially when the members of class have as much interest in communication as in ethics. It is also a good way to deal with culture and communication problems. The cultural and racial minorities in the United States have different ethical standards that make communication difficult. The people in culture A may have no image or distorted and deficient ideas about culture B and vice versa. Role reversal may help to surmount this dilemma as long as both cultures have the same roles represented. Often, however, certain roles exist in one culture and not in another. In one culture the same role may have a different of totally opposite connotation - the role of the private proprietor or capitalist in the U.S.A. or in Soviet Russia. The dissemination of factual knowledge does not alleviate the tensions arising from such clashes. Even if full information could be attained by observation and analysis these are not adequate tools for exploring the more sophisticated aspects of inter-cultural relations. Deep action methods have proven to be of indisputable value because they can, in the form of sociodrama, investigate, explore as well as treat in one stroke, the conflicts between two cultures, and at the same time undertake to change the attitudes of the members of one culture versus the other.

Sociodramatic methods have important implications for educational situations. It can extend the one-way communication process from teacher to pupil to a more inclusive three-way communication process of teacher - student, student - student, and student -teacher. In this interactional learning situation, teachers as well as pupils earn their role-status throught the quality of the communication in their interpersonal relations. Socio-dramatic methods free students

from the traditional authoritarian roles and gives them more flexible roles, just as it frees students from the subordinate role-status and stimulates them to become more active, interactive and self-directive. Sociodramatic methods, especially when used with sociometric techniques, set the conditions for the most democratic learning situation yet developed for the classroom.

Sociodrama can be used as a technique for playing out any real-life situation. It provides the opportunity to see how different roles are enacted, how different conflicts are solved. Sociodrama can be used by groups to clarify and test the adequacy of social habits, skills, attitudes and values in action. Suggestions can be obtained for solving family, group, or community problems.

Advantages of the Sociodramatic Method

The method has several advantages compared with training in actual life experience, particularly for the individual in the formative stages. First, in actual life situations an individual often has difficulty in learning from a mistake due to the earnestness of the situation. In his anxiety he may repeat his error when a similar occasion occurs, thus retarding his leaning to overcome it. Second, for may individuals actual life situations encourage an emotional inertia if the performance is successful in a given role, and more is not demanded. Third, actual life situations even if these develop an individual to the point of fitting perfectly into a certain role, they make him single-tracked and exclude from his horizon other varities of situations. Fourth, everybody is expected to live up to his official role in life, but the individual craves to embody far more roles than those he is allowed to act out in life and even one or more varities within the same role.

Scociodrama has two roots - socius, which means "the associate, the other fellow," and drama, which means "action." Sociodrama would mean action in behalf of the other fellow. The action is not just the action of the doing of the sociodrama with the other people and audience as a corporate whole. It is the action that goes into the planning and directing of the sociodrama.

A Laboratory Approach to Communication Ethics

During the past two years I have taught Communication Ethics by having students develop case studies or scenarios and then turn them into sociodramas to be done in the class. I do a demonstration of the scripted sociodrama, which will be included with this paper, and then encourage them to write and direct scripted sociodramas that deal with pertinent ethical problems.

The major discovery I have made in doing this is that all ethical problems are a part of communication problems and that good communication can effect the way in which the ethical decision is interpreted. I have seen ethical decisions made by individuals that might have been difficult for others in the sociodramas to take made quite acceptable and positive by good communication. I have also noticed that ethical choice must be forced and if there are not time limitations on the sociodramas and no demand for choices to be made the students will just continue to talk to avoid that crucial point of making the decisions.

A minor discovery I made in doing these communication ethics sociodramas is that the scripted or semi-scripted ones work better than unscripted. The unscripted tended to get into the fringes of therapy and personality problems rather than into the area of ethical concern. Perhaps this should be stated more explicitly as a warning to teachers who might want to use this method of teaching communication

ethics.

General Requirements for Communication Ethics Sociodramas

The essential first requirement is a case study, scenario, or script that presents the ethical problem in a simple clear fashion. The script should have the following parts:

1. Background and Context in which the essential information is given and the cast of characters with a brief description of their position and relationships. (This is what Kenneth Burke calls the "scene" in the dramatic pentad.)
2. Narrative and Plot in which a sequence of actions are outlined in a time order.
3. The Point of Entry or where the group is when the script ends and the free (conditioned by the script only) action begins.
4. The Situation That Forces the Ethical Decision and if necessary a statement about the nature of the decisions that must be made by the participants.

The scenarios should not include speculations about motives or any suggestions that might explain the behavior of the people in terms of choices that were pre-determined.

Other general requirements for a scripted sociodrama are copies of the script for all and some private information for certain characters. What is known to all should be freely shared but the people with private information have the choice of either revealing or not revealing this private data as the sociodrama unfolds.

Here is a simple description of what may happen in a structured sociodrama. It'll help get the basic ideas in focus. Let us suppose it is a family scene with; a father, mother, and two children, and the structured conflict is in a situation about a conflict between the

children over whether the daughter can have her friends over to the house for a "slumber party". The emerging conflict would be centered on the effect of such a party on the others and it is assumed that "nobody sleeps" at so called "slumber parties". The father may object since he says, "last time you had a party I couldn't sleep all night." (This bringing in of information is the perrogative of each player.) The mother, knowing how her daughter wants to be popular with the girls, may fight for her right to have the party. (Her mother may add information that "all the girls have promised to be quiet.") The son may take this as favoritism and attack the whole family. There may be many twists to these structured sociodramas, so it is almost impossible to describe a typical one.

Directing the Unstructured Sociodrama

Using the above as an example, here are some possible inputs from the director:

1. Initiation - getting the sociodrama written, the people chosen and warmed up with an unstructured bit, and a dynamic description of not only what the situation is but a few statements about how the characters may be feeling.

The person writing the scenario is also the director. A sociodrama requires a director, but the director's work is usually just the preparation of the script, "casting the scenario" and getting the scene started. Very seldom is the director needed during the playing of the sociodrama, unless it just isn't working and some direction or intervention is needed. The director should lead the discussion with the audience and the players at the end. Another duty of the director is to keep the sociodrama within the time bounds of the class.

A stage or a place to do the sociodrama and a bare suggestion of props is all that is needed. The director can set the stage by just arranging the furniture.

In a class situation it is better to have the people draw roles than to assign them simply because some person may think there was an ulterior reason for giving them a certain role. The director can do this "casting" by having the scripts in envelopes and letting people draw if there are a group of volunteers or by drawing lots if a larger group is used.

Unstructured and Structured Sociodrama

There are two distinct types of sociodrama: structured and unstructured. In the latter the director will get volunteers to play certain characters and then help them evolve a situation and let them act out a spontaneous scene. In the structured sociodrama the characters are delineated in advance and the initial situation is clearly outlined and the scene begins at the point of crisis.

To do a structured sociodrama it is often necessary to warmup the people by doing an informal and unstructured type sociodrama. The players need to be freed from their usual roles, though in role playing there is usually a bit of self. The structured sociodrama provides the characters with certain limitations that enable them to get into the roles better than when there is complete freedom. Due to the nature of sociodrama the people can play roles and find alternative ways of behaving which are not present in simulations.

Structured sociodrama are scripted in part as illustrated in the sheets that follow. Copies of this material are often given to the characters and the audience and thus provide guides. There must be a director to a structured sociodrama. The director may also be the writer of the sociodrama. The script is only to get the drama

started and then the players (under the guidance of the director) take over and do the scene.

2. Encouraging. Sometimes the silent members of the cast need to be encouraged to express their fellings and, if they do not pick up on covert signs of encouragement, the director will ask them how they feel. (The emphasis is usually on feeling rather than thinking.)

3. Guiding - done by simple questions to characters about what they have said and how they feel and, at times, getting them back to the structure of the sociodrama.

4. Role Reversal - switching roles so the father may be playing the mother, etc. just to give them a different perspective on what is happening. At first this may be disruptive to the flow of the drama but it is rather easy to do under simple instruction. During the sociodrama the emphasis is on the players and not on the technique so only brief explanations should be given.

5. Time Intervention - The moving the clock ahead by the director who tells what has taken place in the intervening time and this, of course, controls the sociodrama. It is also a method of getting the characters to interact more.

6. Addition or removal of characters - such as adding a grandmother to the above scene or having the son "sleep over" with a friend.

7. Use of alter-egos or consciences for characters. This is a methodology in which the inner thoughts and feelings of the characters are expressed by other people who stand behind the character and speak only to the character.

The alter-ego only speaks when the character is speaking and indicates he or she wants to say something by patting the character on the shoulder. When the alter-ego is finished the character continues with the interrupted conversation. Sometimes there is confusion at this

point and the alter-egos start talking to each other. The director may use the alter-ego to get the character to more openly express feelings or to show the conflict that would be present when a character is caught in a double bind.

8. Carry Ons. This is a British expression, not an airline phrase, and usually follows some interruption as the director makes the needed interjection and then says, "Carry on".

9. Termination. The structured sociodrama is not designed to solve problems, merely to present facets of the problem. A scene may be terminated at any time by the director. Often the sociodrama is stopped at the height of the conflict.

10. Followup Discussion and Defusing. The director usually leads a discussion of the sociodrama after it is ended. As people join in the discussion the sociodrama may start up again. For example, if someone in the audience says she thinks the mother would have done this or that, the director may reconstruct the scene and have the person making the comment do the role. The players enter into the discussion and can add a dimension by talking about how they felt about their "characters".

Usually there should be about as much time for the discussion of the sociodrama as there was for the presentation.

The Structured Sociodrama

A good way to lead into the more complete scenarios usually done to provide learning experiences related to communication ethics is through the structured sociodramas. In these there is enough imformation given in sheets such as those that follow to get the group started. The major difference between unstructured, structured, and scripted sociodramas is obvious when you look at the scripts. In the unstructured the group may improvise the whole scene and a script is not used. In the structured the characters and the situations are presented with

more scripting. However in the scripted there is a scenario and the players are held to it much more.

Here are two sociodramas. One is a family situation where the conflict is over what is to be done and the other is centered on a family conflict that was already triggered off by an incident. Both have several levels of conflict.

STRUCTURED SOCIODRAMA Dr. Paul Hunsinger

Explanation to Actors:

You are asked to play the roles with spontaneity. There is a bit of self in roleplaying, but do not be concerned over self revelation since you will have a chance to discuss how you felt while playing the role in the discussion to follow the sociodrama.

CHARACTERS:

Mother - 48 years old...has a family of four; a son of a previous marriage of her husband (now deceased) from his first wife who died, her first son, a younger son, and a daughter...she has always showed more love for her first child than the other members of the family...she is a gentle loving mother, uneducated but quite wise.

Oldest Son - 34 years old...construction worker...jealous of affection of his step-mother...hot tempered...suspicious of others... protective of mother.

Second Son - 31 years old... successful evangelist with a growing following...loving and overt in showing affection...often a center of controversy due to his style of preaching.

SITUATION:

OLDEST SON, MOTEHR, AND OTHER MEMBERS OF THE FAMILY CAME TO A MEETING WHERE THE SECOND SON WAS A FEATURED SPEAKER. HE HAD BEEN AWAY FROM THE FAMILY FOR OVER A YEAR. WHEN HE WAS INFORMED THAT HIS FAMILY WAS IN THE AUDIENCE HE IGNORED THEM, NOT EVEN INTRODUCING THEM, AND TOLD THE PEOPLE THEY ALL WERE HIS FAMILY. HIS FAMILY WAS HURT BY THIS.

AFTER THIS INCIDENT THE SECOND SON RETURNED HOME AND THE OLDEST SON FORCED A CONFRONTATION. THE FAMILY WAS NOT JUST UPSET BUT THOUGHT THE SECOND SON WAS LOSING HIS MIND.

"Opening Line of Oldest Son"

"...you had no right to treat your mother that way..."

STRUCTURED SOCIODRAMA

Explanation to Actors:

You are asked to play the roles as suggested in the description of the characters but with a certain freedom of imagination that comes with the spontaniety of getting into the part. In all the roles there will be a bit of self, but do not let this inhibit you since you too will be able to discuss your role after you have done the scene.

characters:

Father - 35 years old...executive with AT&T..in good health...tends to be domineering with family...hobby is working on several cars he has acquired recently...enjoys relaxing by working with his hands.

Mother - 33 years old...recently returned to full-time work as a nurse's aide in local hospital...trying to find her identity outside the home...dislikes arguments and wants everyone to be happy all the time.

Son - 16 years old...doing poorly in school...wants to work at a service station located 10 miles from home and school... has usually gotten his own way by playing one parent against the other...STAR FOOTBALL PLAYER.

Daughter - 13 years old...feels left out by the family...has her own friends and ignores family for them...jealous of any attention given her brother...wants to be loved but gives no love in return...SMARTER THAN HER BROTHER.

(Warm UP)

Father is interested in why Son has been doing poorly in school. Daughter knows he is missing classes to be with "Becky" who lives close to the school and has boys over to her house. Mother is more concerned with what he is doing with "Becky". Son is not interested in school since it is so boring and is not having sex with "Becky" but is working on her car.

SITUATION:

SON WANTS TO DROP OUT OF SCHOOL AND LEARN TO BE A MECHANIC. HE NEEDS A CAR TO DRIVE BACK AND FORTH TO THE SERVICE STATION WHERE HE WORKS. SON WANTS TO GIVE UP FOOTBALL. FATHER INSISTS HE MUST GO TO COLLEGE AND DOESN"T WANT HIM TO USE THE CARS. FATHER WAS TOP ATHLETE IN COLLEGE. MOTHER WANTS EVERYONE TO BE HAPPY AND DOESN'T WANT A BIG FAMILY FIGHT OVER THESE ISSUES.
DAUGHTER FEELS IGNORED AND WANTS TO BE SHOWN SOME ATTENTION. SHE ALSO THINKS SHE KNOWS MORE ABOUT WHY PEOPLE DO AND SAY CERTAIN THINGS THAN THE OTHERS IN THE FAMILY.

"OPENING LINE: SON- "...I'm quitting school..."

THE SCRIPTED SOCIODRAMA

The major difference between the structured sociodrama and the scripted sociodrama is the imposition of the script on the roleplayers in a scripted sociodrama. This gives the "scriptwriter" and the director more control and added information can be given to the audience in this type of dramatic presentation.

The audience becomes a more active part of the sociodrama when this technique is followed since usually there is some decision required on the part of the audience. In some scripted sociodramas the audience is asked to discuss the scene and the whole situation about which the action centered and then make a decision as a jury would after listening to a trial. The people in the audience may have comments about the way the sociodrama script was read or acted in relation to their feelings about the plot and characters and, in this sense, the people in the audience are really directors. At times the designated director may have the person making the criticism of the way the scene was done step up and act the role.

I would add some suggestions for those interested in developing this scripted approach to sociodrama, based on using this method to teach communication ethics.

1. Keep the antagonist balanced against the protagonist and show the conflict in a fair manner.
2. Do not use known characters since the argument may be centered too much on what these people would do in a real life reference than in the obliqueness of sociodrama.
3. Do not give direction on how the lines should be read. The script is more important than the "acting" in this form of drama.
4. Copies of the script should be given to the audience as well as the "Information Sheet". The "Discussion Questions" should be

kept at a minimal level to avoid over-structuring.

5. The audience should be forced to vote or decide on a secret ballot first and without much discussion rather than having the discussion determined the decisions each should make. Let the sociodrama be the basis for individual decision making rather than what is said in the discussion.

When Jacob Moreno started to develop sociodrama he used incidents from the daily newspapers in Vienna. The people were not to do sociodramas and then make judgements, as in the scripted sociodramas, but they were encouraged to seek a "catharsis of integration". It was a means of vicarious interaction, of empathic response, of "agape" love, and a means of understanding others more deeply to be able to understand ourselves more clearly. By reading the roles of others and responding to others in the scripted situations we can broaden our empirical base for living and do it in a safe manner.

The following example of a scripted sociodrama was developed by Leonard Kramish, a close friend who was the Coordinator of Speech Activities for the Denver Public Schools. This script has been used in both high school and college classes to give students experience in drama, discussion and debate, "raising the level of social consciousness" and in courses in communication ethics. I think scripted sociodrama might be even more popular in the future.

THE CASE AGAINST FRAU BRENNER

Your task is to render a decisions of guilty of innocent for Frau Brenner...

Read carefully the following interview.....

A - What is your name?

B - My name is Frau Brenner.

A - Where are you from Frau Brenner?

B - I was originally from Munich...but when the war started, we moved to Berlin.

A - You are married?

B - Oh, yes, for thirty years now.

A - And you have a family?

B - I have a son...He is married now and I am a grandmother.

A - Frau Brenner, when I mention the word holocaust...what meaning does it have for you?

B - The destruction of the Jews during the time of the Nazis.

A - During this time, Frau Brenner, tell us about your life.. what was your husband doing?

B - We had a good life then...better than we had ever had before...The party brought us some security for the first time in our lives. During the early years of I think 1936, my husband started to work in one of those amunition plants around Munich...This was the first time he has a good job...Things were very difficult for our family before that time...Now we could buy a home...a nice home and raise our family in some kind of security...

A - Did you and your husband take any interest in politics during this time?

B - Oh, no...We didn't participate in any political activities. Hitlar to us was a leader who brought us out of poverty and despair to security and pride in being a German...My husband was not a Nazi...

A - Frau Brenner, during this time were you aware of what was happening to the Jews in Germany?

B - I did not know that they were killed in those camps...We only thought they were to be relocated to other areas.

A - You saw them take the Jews away?

B - One could not help but observe this...They closed Jewish stores... Sometimes they broke windows and wrote Juden on the front of the stores...They told us that we should boycott Jewish stores.

A - Why the Jews Frau Brenner?

B - They told us that the Jews were powerful and hostile towards Germany and that they were plotting to take over and acquire world domination...Germany had no other choice than to rid itself of its Jews...I had nothing personally against them. Our leaders told us that they were Germany's misfortune. It was only right that Germany take back the property the Jews stole from her. I did not realize that the Jews were to be killed. It was most unfortunate.

A - You did nothing to stop this?

B - I did not feel it was my place to do anything. The leaders of our people I believed, knew what was best for Germany. We could do nothing else but follow our leaders.

.....

Before you decide on the guilt and innocence of Frau Brenner...

Read carefully the information sheet and discuss the questions found on page 4.....

INFORMATION SHEET

CASE: FRAU BRENNER

Frau Brenner developed her attitudes toward the Jews through the literature written in Germany for many years. German writers and historians expressed popular contempt for Western thought and principles. Individualism, pacifism and democracy were scorned.

The Germans grasped National Socialism frantically for a belief in a way of living that would give meaning to their lives. Prior to the period of National Socialism, Germany was split which created among the Germans a feeling of being behind the rest of Western Europe. By way of compensation, an attitude of German superiority developed.

Germans preached the necessity of purging German culture of all foreign influences and destroyed all movements toward an open society.

Discussion Questions:

The jury should consider the following questions before they reach a decision -

In light of the evidence presented, could Frau Brenner have responded differently?

Can an individual act separately from the dictates of his society? If yes, what specific examples can be given?

What alternatives are available to an individual who does not wish to follow the policies of a given country?

Frau Brenner was faced with the decision to follow the policies of Germany and live a secure comfortable life for herself and her family, or to react morally to the persecution she saw...
Should the moral decision take precedent over her concern for the welfare and safety of her own family?

Can a person have a private ethic that is in opposition to the ethics of society?

COMMUNICATION ETHICS "SCENARIOS FOR SCRIPTED SOCIODRAMAS"

The primary methodology for learning communication ethics in this course will be the development of scenarios (case studies developed as scripts) for use in sociodramas (roleplaying with emphasis on social situation). Types of roleplaying for sociodrama will be discussed and demonstrated in class and we will become rather proficient in the use of these techniques by the end of the quarter. However, the script or scenario is of most importance since each person will be asked to develop several scenarios.

The scenario should include the following sections:

1. Statement of Problem in Communication Ethics.

2. Scene or situation describing briefly the background and events leading up to the present point of conflict. "This is what has happened up to this Point."

3. Crisis, (the point where decisions must be made) is developed in a short narrative as events happening now.

4. IF NECESSARY, A LIST OF THE CHARACTERS WITH MORE EXPLICIT INFORMATION ABOUT EACH CAN BE ADDED TO CLARIFY POSITIONS. Use a separate sheet for each character if you do not want the others to know what the characters think and feel.

5. "The Grabber" - a sharply focused question, such as "What would you do if you were in this situation?

In writing these scenarios you will probably find that changes will take place as you write them and the characters interact on the plot and the plot develops certain attitudes in the characters.

The scenario should be developed in a complete form and made available for both actors and audience. Three copies should be given to the instructor. It may be that this approach to the study of communication ethics might be used for dramatic purposes to help writers and actors and even directors.

Paul Hunsinger
Professor of Communication
CBN University

CHARACTERISTICS OF A GOOD SCENARIO FOR COMMUNICATION ETHICS:

1. Most good scenarios are "life situation" oriented. Fiction based on "fact" is most interesting to read. This is the method of parables used by Christ to illustrate his teaching. The place to begin is with what happens to people in a real situation and then expand the scene and plot to a greater general application.

2. The scenario should be "fairly typical" and not peculiar to such a specific problem that the participants and audience could not easily identify with what is at the heart of the scenario.

3. In writing the scenario, minimize the details but not at risk of omitting what is ethically significant!!! Avoid giving stage directions to characters and shun subplots. Keep the scenario focused on the major ethical problem. HOW THE ETHICAL PROBLEM IS COMMUNICATED, BOTH IN THE WRITING OF THE SCENARIO AND IN THE "ACTING", IS A PART OF THE PROBLEM AND OFTEN THE SOLUTION. (In some instances in previous classes I have been amused at the surprise felt by the author of the scenario in finding that the characters solved the ethical problem by the way in which they communicated with each other.)

4. Avoid including speculation about motives, intentions or feelings in presenting the characters in the scenario. The characters in a sociodrama are shaped by the events and social pressures. Let the characters evolve rather than describing them in detail.

5. Beware of the "intentional fallacy" or overidentification of self with the characters. Naturally you will be writing about yourself in these scenarios, but try to maintain sufficient objectivity to let the characters live as "real people" rather than shadows of yourself.

6. Stop the narrative at the point of highest ethical conflict! This is where the grabber part interupts the story and forces the audience (and the participants) to make a decision. If the conflict is not sharp at this point in your narrative you might have to continue, edit or make some other choice since the whole scenario is focused on "what would you do?" If this question can not be answered because of some fault in the presentation, you have a weak scenario.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Haas, Robert Bartlett. "A Summary of Findings from an Exploratory Study--Sociodrama in Education," Psychodrama and Sociodrama in American Education. edited by Robert Bartly Haas. New York: Beacon House, 1949, 420-430.

Haas, Robert B. "The Consultant in Sociometry and Sociodrama Speaks," Sociatry, 2 (1948) 257-259.

Hansen, Bert. "Sociodrama in a Small-Community Therapy Program," Sociatry, 1 (1947) 92-96.

Harshfield, H.W. and J.P. Schmidt. "Playing Out Our Problems in Sociodrama," Psychodrama and Sociodrama in American Education, editied by Robert Bartley Haas. New York: Beacon House, 1949, 363-368.

Haskell, Martin R. "Sociodrama and Socioanalysis," Psychodrama and Audience Attitude Change by Ira A. Greenberg. Beverly Hills, California: Thyrsus Publishing Co., 1968. 248-257.

Lippitt, Ronald, Leland P. Bradford, and Benne, Kenneth D., "Sociodramatic Clarification of Leader and Group Roles, Societry, Vol I. No. 1, 1947, 82-91.

Moreno, J.L. "Sociodrama; A Method for the Analysis of Social Conflicts," Psychodrama Monographs, No. 1, 1944.

Moreno, J.L. "The Concept of Sociodrama," Psychodrama and Audience Attitude Change by Ira A. Greenberg. Beverly Hills, California; Thyrsus Publishing Co., 1968, 28-45.

Moreno, J.L. Who Shall Survive? Foundations of Sociometry Group Psychotherapy and Sociodrama. Beacon, New York: Beacon House, Inc., 1953.

Murray, Elwood, "Combining General Semantics and Sociodrama Sociatry, Vol II, No. 1-2, 1948, 69-72.

Murray Elwood, "Sociodrama and Psychodrama in the Basic Communication Class," Sociatry, Vol II, No. 3-4, 1948.

Murray, Elwood, "Sociodrama in a Special Pilot Course on Intercultural Communication," Psychodrama and Sociodrama in American Education, edited by Robert Bartley Haas. New York; Beacon House, 1949, 330-333.

Sheats, Paul H. "Sociodrama as an Aid to Large Group Communication," Sociatry, 4 (1948), 431-435.

"The Concept of Sociodrama -a new Approach to the Problem of Inter-Cultural Relations," Sociometry, 6 (1943 b), 434-449.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

COMMUNICATION ETHICS

Alden, Joseph, Christian Ethics, or The Science of Duty, Regency Press, 1976

Alexander, Archabald, Outlines of Moral Science, Regency Press, 1976.

Allen, Charles L., God's Psychiatry, Revell.

Anderson, Kay, I and Thou In the Here and Now, Word Books, 1977.

Apostol, Robert Z., ed., Human Values in a Secular World, Humanities, 1970.

Arnold, A. Stuart, How Can I Grow As A Christian, Broadman, 1972.

Baelz, Peter, Ethics and Belief, Crossroad Books, 1977.

Bahnsen, Greg, Theonomy in Christian Ethics,Presby and Reformed, 1977.

Baier, Kurt, Moral Point of View: A Rational Basis of Ethics, Random, 1966.

Baird. A.W., Studies in Pascal's Ethics, Humanities, 1976.

Barclay, William, Ethics in a Permissive Society, Harper-Row, 1972.

Barcus, Nancy B., Developing a Christian Mind, Inter-Varsity, 1977.

Barnette, Henlee H., Introducing Christian Ethics, Broadman, 1961.

Barth, Karl., Christian Life, Allenson, 1930.

Bartlette, William H., Ethics: Real or Relative? Vantage.

Bascom, John, Ethics or Science of Duty, AMS Press, 1976.

Beach, Waldo, Christian Life, John Knox, 1967.

Beach, Waldo & Niebuhr, Richard, eds. Christian Ethics--Sources of the Living Tradition, 2nd ed., Ronald, 1973.

Beck, Hubert, Fantasies for Fantastic Christians, Concordia, 1977.

Beck, R.N. & Orr, J.B., Ethical Choice, Free Press, 1970.

Beecher, Catherine E., The Elements of Mental and Moral Philosophy: Founded Upon Experience, Reason and the Bible, Scholarly, 1976.

Beeson, Trevor, An Eye for an Ear, Allenson, 1972.

Bennett, John C., The Radical Imperative: From Theology to Social Ethics, Westminister, 1975.

Bentham, Jeremy, Introduction to the Principles of Morals and Legislation, Lafleur, J., Ed., Hafner, 1948.

Bergson, Henri, The Two Sources of Morality and Religion, Greenwood, 1974.

Berkohf, L., Manual of Christian Doctrine, Grand Rapids, Wm. B. Eerdmans Publ. Co.,1933.

Berryhill, Elizabeth, Cup of Trembling, Seabury.

Birch, Bruce C. & Rasmussen, Larry L. Bible & Ethics in the Christian Life, Augsburg, 1976.

Bisagno, John R. Power of Positive Living, Broadman, 1970.

Bittleston, Adam, The Spirit of the Circling Stars: Human Problems in a Cosmic Setting, St. George Book Service, 1975.

Black, Algernon D., First Book of Ethics, Watts, 1965.

Black, Max, The Morality of Scholarship, Cornell University Press, 1967.

Blaiklock, E.M. & Blaiklock, D.A. Why Didn't They Tell Me? Zondervan.

Blanshard, Brand, Reason and Goodness, Humanities, 1961.

Bockle, Franz & Pohier, Jacques-Marie, eds., Moral Formation & Christianity Concilium, Crossroad Books, Seabury, 1977.

Bolingbroke, Henry S. Reflections Concerning Innate Moral Principles, Scholarly, 1976.

Bonar, Horatius, How Shall I go to God?, Baker Book, 1977.

Bonhoeffer, Dietrich, Ethics, Bethge, Eberhard, ed., Macmillan, 1965.

Boulding, Kenneth E., Beyond Economics, Essays on Society, Religion and Ethics, University of Michigan Press, 1970.

Boyd, Malcolm, Human Like Me, Jesus, Pyramid Pub., 1973.

Braaten, Carl E., Eschatology & Ethics: Essays on the Theology & Ethics of the Kingdom of God, Augsburg, 1974.

Brauch, Manfred T., Set Free To Be, Judson, 1975.

Brennan, Joseph G., Ethics & Morals, Harper-Row, 1973.

Browne, T. & Johnson, Samuel Christian Morals, 2nd ed., Kraus Repr. 1927.

Brunner, Man in Revolt, Philadelphia, 1947.

Buber, Martin, I and Thou, trans, Walter Kaufman, New York, 1970.

Burke, Kenneth, The Rhetoric of Religion, Boston, Beacon Press, 1961, p.v.

Burtness, James H. Whatever You Do: An Essay in Christian Ethics, Augsburg, 1967.

Carnell, E.J., A Philosophy of the Christian Religion, Grand Rapids, 1952.

Carter, Del, Ryan and Tom K. Good News for Grimy Gulch, Judson, 1977.

Charles, R. Christian Ethics and Problems in Society, Christian Classics, 19

Chauncey, George A., Decisions! Decisions! John Knox, 1972.

Childs, James M., Jr., Christian Anthropology and Ethics, Fortress, 1977.

Clark, Gordon H. Religion, Reason and Revelation, Preby and Reformed.

Cohen, Felix, Ethical Systems & Legal Ideals, Greenwood, 1976.

Coleman, William V., Finding a Way to Follow, Morehouse, 1977.

Conover, C. Eugene, Personal Ethics in an Impersonal World, Westminster, 196

Cox, Harvey, The Seduction of the Spirit, New York, 1973.

Croce, Benedetto, Philosophy of the Practical, Biblo, 1913.

Darnell, Donald K. and Brockreide, Wayne, Persons Communicating, Englewood Cliffs, N.J., Prentice-Hall Co., 1976.

Davis, Philip, Introduction to Moral Philosophy, Merrill, 1973.

De Beauvoir, Simone, Ethics of Ambiguity, Citadel Press, 1962

De Burgh, W.G., From Morality to Religion, Merrill, 1973.

De LaFuente, Victorino, The Normal Pattern of Man's Ethical Behavior, Pageant-Poseidon.

Durland, William R. & Bruening, William H., eds. Ethical Issues: A Search for Contemporary Patterns, Mayfield Pub., 1975.

Dworkin, Gerald, Determinism, Free Will & Moral Responsibility, Prentice-Hall, 1970/

Erickson, Millard J., ed., Relativism in Contemporary Christian Ethics, Baker Book, 1974.

Fagothey, Austin, Right & Reason: Ethics in Theory and Practice, 1972, Mosby

Ferm, Vergilius, T, ed., Encyclopedia of Morals, Greenwood, 1956.

Findlay, John N. Values and Intentions, Humanities, 1961.

Fletcher, Joseph and Montgomery, John W., Situation Ethics: True or False, Bethany Fell, 1972.

Forell, George W., Ethics of Decision, Fortress, 1955.

Frankena,William, Ethics, Englewood Cliffs, N.J., 1970

Frankens, William K. & Granrose, John T., Introductory Readings in Ethics, Prentice-Hall, 1974.

Fromm, Erich, Heart of Man, Harper-Row, 1971.

Fromm, Erich, Man for Himself, Fawcett World, 1976.

Fromm, Erich, Man for Himself: An Inquiry into the Psychology of Ethics, HR&W, 1947.

Gardner, E. Clinton, Biblical Faith & Social Ethics, Harper-Row 1960.

Geisler, Norman, Ethics: Alternatives & Issues, Zondervan, 1971.

Geisler, Norman L. The Christian Ethic of Love, Zondervan, 1973.

Goodpaster, Kenneth, ed., Perspectives on Morality: Essays by William Frankena. University of Notre Dame Press, 1976.

Griffin, Em, The Mind Changers: The Art of Christian Persuasion, Wheaton,Il, Tyndale House Publishers, Inc., 1976.

Gustafson, James M., Can Ethics Be Christian? University of Chicago Press, 19

Gustafson, James M., Christian Ethics and the Community, United Church, 1971.

Gustafson, James M., Church as Moral Decision-Maker, United Church, 1970.

Hardin, Garrett, Exploring New Ethics for Survival: The Voyage of the Spaceship Beagle, Penguin, 1973.

Hare, Michael, Multiple Universe: On the Nature of Spiritual Reality, Julian, 1968.

Hare, Richard M., Freedom & Reason, Oxford University Press, 1965.

Hare, Richard M., Language of Morals, Oxford University Press, 1952.

Henry, Carl F., ed., Baker's Dictionary of Christian Ethics, Baker Book, 1973.

Henry, Carl F., Christian Personal Ethics, Baker Book, 1977.

Hertz, Karl H.,ed., Two Kingdoms & One World: A Sourcebook in Christian Social Ethics, Augsburg, 1976.

Higgins, Thomas, Ethical Theories in Conflict, Glencoe, 1967.

Hopkins, Mark, Lectures on Moral Science, AMS Press, 1976.

Hudson, W.D., Ethical Intuition, St. Martin, 1967.

Hume, David, Enquires Concerning Human Understanding & Concerning the Principles of Morals, 3rd ed., Oxford University Press, 1975.

Hume David, Enquiry Concerning the Principles of Morals, 2nd ed., Open Court, 1960.

Huxley, Thomas H. & Huxley, Julian S., Evolution & Ethics, Kraus Repr., 1893-1943.

Inge, William R., Christian Ethics & Modern Problems, Greenwood, 1930.

James, Muriel and Jongeward, Dorothy, Born to Win: Transactional Analysis with Gestalt Experiments, Reading, MA. Addison-Wesley Publishing Co., 1971.

James, William, Moral Philosophy of William James, Roth, John K., ed., Appollo Eds., 1969.

Joad, C.E., Intro by Classics in Philosophy & Ethics, Kennikat, 1971.

Jones, William, et al., Approaches to Ethics, 3rd ed., McGraw, 1977.

Jones, William T., et al., Approaches to Ethics: Representative Selections from Classical Times to the Present, McGraw, 1969.

Kant, Immauel, Critique of Practical Reason, Beck Lewis W., Bobbs, 1956.

Kant, Immauel, Doctrine of Virtue, Part Two of the Metaphysic of Morals, University of Pennsylvania Press, 1971.

Kant, Immanuel, Lectures on Ethics, Peter Smith.

Kaplan, Morton A., Justice, Human Nature & Political Obligation, Free Press, 1976.

Katz, Joseph, Writers on Ethics: Classical & Contemporary, Krieger, 1962, 1973.

Keeling, Michael, What Is Right? What is Wrong? Judson, 1970.

Kennedy, Eugene, A Sense of Life, a Sense of Sin, Doubleday, 1975.

Kierkegaard, Soren, Philosophical Fragments, Trns, David Swenson, Princeton, NJ, 1948.

Kirk, Kenneth E., ed. Personal Ethics, bu B.H. Streeter, et al., Arno, 1934.

Kirk, Kenneth E., The Vision of God, Dunstan G. R., ed., Attic Press, 1978.

Kropotkin, Peter, Ethics, Arno, 1968.

Langdon, Gilkey, Maker of Heaven and Earth, Garden City NY. 1965.

Lehman, Paul, Ethics in a Christian Context, Harper-Row, 1976.

Lewis, C.S., The Abolition of Man, New York, 1947.

Lewis, Clarnecy I., Values & Imperatives: Studies in Ethics, Lange, John, 3rd., Stanford University Press, 1969.

Lindsell, Harold, The World, The Flesh & The Devil, Baker Book.

Long, Edward L., Jr., Survey of Christian Ethics, Oxford University Press, 1967.

Macquarrie, John, ed., Dictionary of Christian Ethics, Westminister, 1967.

Malinowski, Bronislaw, The Foundations of Faith & Morals, Folcroft, 1974.

Mandelbaum, Maurice, The Phenomenology of Moral Experience, Johns Hopkins, 1969.

Margolis, Joseph, Values & Conduct, Oxford University Press, 1971.

Maritain, Jacques, Essay on Christian Philosophy, Philos. Lib., 1955.

Maritain, Jacques, Person & the Common Good, University of Notre Dame Press, 1966.

Mathews, Shailer & Smith, Gerald B., eds., Dictionary of Religion & Ethics, Gale, 1971.

May, William E., Becoming Human; An Inivitation to Christian Ethics, Pflaum-Standard, 1975.

McCann, Thomas F., Ethics: Theory & Practice, Loyola, 1971.

McGreal, Ian P., Problems of Ethics, Chandler, 1970.

McLuham, Marshall, Understanding Media: The Extension of Man, NAL, 1973.

Meyer, Donald H., The Instructed Conscience: The shaping of the American National Ethic, University of Pennsylvania Press, 1972.

Meyners, Robert & Wooster, Claire, Solomon's Sword: Clarifying Values In the Church, Abingdon, 1977.

Mill, John S., Essays on Ethics, Religion & Society, Univ. of Toronto Press, 1969.

Miller, Allen O., ed., Christian Declaration of Human Rights, Eerdmans, 1977.

Mohler, James A., Dimension of Faith, Loyola, 1969.

Murdoch, Iris, Sovereignty of Good, Schocken, 1971.

Muzzey, David S., Ethics as a Religion, 2nd ed., Ungar.

Neumann, Erich, Depth Psychology & A New Ethic, Putnam, 1970.

Neibuhr, H. Richard, Responsible Self, Harper=Row, 1963

Osborn, E., Ethical Patterns in Early Christian Thought, Cambridge University Press, 1976.

Parker, DeWitt, Human Values: An Interpretation of Ethics Based on a Study of Values, AMS Press, 1976.

Peschke, C., Christian Ethics, Chr. Classics, 1975.

Peters, R., Psychology & Ethical Development: A Collection of Articles on Psychological Theories, Ethical Development & Human Understandin Crane-Russak Co., 1975.

Pice Dolls Mirandola, On the Dignity of Man, Indianapolis, 1965.

Pike, James A., Doing the Truth: A summary of Christian Ethics, Mac Mo;;am. 1965.

Powell, Enoch, No Easy Answers, Crossroad Books, Seabury, 1974.

Prior, Arthur N., Logic & the Basis of Ethics, Oxford University Press, 1949.

Ramsey, Ian T., Christian Ethics & Contemporary Philosophy, MacMillan, 1966.

Rashdall, H., Conscience & Christ: Six Lectures on Christian Ethics, Kraus Repr., 1916.

Ridenour, Fritz, How to Be A Christian In An Unchristian World, Regal, 1972.

Robert, Charles, ed., Manipulated Man; The Power of Man Over Man, Its Risks & Its Limits, Pickwick, 1977.

Rogers, Isabel, In Response to God: How Christian Make Ethical Decisions, John Knox, 1969

Ross, W. David, Foundations of Ethics, Oxford University Press, 1939.

Sargent, William, Battle for the Mind, Baltimore, 1961.

Sathre, Freda S., Olson, Ray W., Whitney, Clarissa I., Let's Talk: An Introduction to Interpersonal Communication, 2nd ed., Glenview, Ill., Scott Foresman and Company, 1977.

Schopenhauer, Arthur, On the Basis of Morality, Bobbs, 1965.

Schweitzer, Albert. Essence of Faith, Citadel Press.

Shairp, J.C., Studies in Poetry & Philosophy, Kennikat, 1970.

Sharp, Frank C., The Aesthetic Element in Morality & Its Place in a Utilitarian Theory of Morals, AMS Press, 1976.

Shriver, Donald W., Jr., How Do You Do & Why?, John Knox, 1967.

Simon, Sidney, B. and Leland W. Howe, and Howard Kirschenbaum, Values Clarification: A Handbook of Practical Strategies for Teachers and Students, New York, Hart Publishing Co., 1972.

Sites, W. Kilmer & Blossom, Barbara C., Ethics in Perspective & Practices, Oceana, 1972

Skinner, B.F., Beyond Freedom and Dignity, Toronto, 1971.

Skinner, Tom, If Christ Is The Answer, What are the Questions? Zondervan, 1974.

Spencer, Herbert, The Principles of Ethics, 2 vols. Liberty Fund.

Stob, Henry, Ethical Reflections: Essays on Moral-Themes, Eerdmans, 1977

Stoeckle, Bernard, ed., The Concise Dictionary of Christian Ethics, Seabury, 1978.

Thielicke, Helmut, Theological Ethics, Bol.1, Foundations, London, 1966.

Thielicke, Helmut, Theological Ethics, Vol. 2, Fortress, 1969.

Thompson, Kenneth W., Christian Ethics & The Dilemmas of Foreign Policy, Duke, 1959.

Tillich, Paul, Morality & Beyond, Harper-Row.

Toulmin, Stephen, Reason in Ethics, Cambridge University Press, 1950-1960.

Tournier, Paul, To Resist or To Surrender? Gilmour, JohnS., tr, John Knox, 1964.

Tournier, Paul, The Meaning of Persons, New York, 1957.

Victor, Frank, Man's Search for Meaning, Richmond, 1965.

Ward, Keith, Ethics & Christianity, Humanities, 1970.

Weiss, Paul, Man's Freedom, S. Illinois Univ. Press, 1967.

Witherspoon, John, Lectures on Moral Philosophy, AMS Press, 1976.

Johannensen, Ethics in Human Communication, Charles Veenstra in Christian Scholar's Review, 1976.